



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808.777	03/24/2004	Seung Min Lee	2080-3242	6072
7	7590 08/24/2006		EXAM	INER
JONATHAN Y. KANG, ESQ.			QUARTERMAN, KEVIN J	
LEE, HONG, I	DEGERMAN, KANG & S	SCHMADEKA	1000000	DA DED MUNADED
14th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
801 S. Figueroa Street			2879	
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5554			DATE MAIL ED: 08/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/808,777	LEE ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kevin Quarterman	2879			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress		
THE REPLY FILED 01 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.			
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A		in the final rejection, wh	nicheverie later In		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da ).	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offite of the final rejection, of	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as even if timely filed,		
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since		
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>					
<ul> <li>3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);			
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		octor olamic.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	` ''	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	` '		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 15-18.	will not be entered, or b)    □ wi   vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-12 and 14</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	It before or on the date of filing a North date of the affidate of the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.  10. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered by the filed of	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)			

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant proposes to add a new independent claim that recites, "...the grooves form a plurality of patterns comprising at least one of circular shapes and polygons..." This recitation appears to come from claim 3 which recites, "the surface of the bulb includes a plurality of patterns having one of a circular shape, a triangular shape, and a polygonal shape..."

It appears that applicant proposes to (1) remove a triangular shape from the list of shapes and (2) recite the grooves forming the plurality of patterns, instead of the plurality of patterns being formed on the surface of the bulb. Since the claims were not previously examined with these new recitations in mind, further consideration and/or search is required.

R

Kgnharay 8/21/06